UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/807,362	03/22/2004	Thierry Glauser	50623.351	3954	
	7590 07/23/201 DERS & DEMPSEY I	EXAMINER			
1 MARITIME I		HELM, CARALYNNE E			
SUITE 300 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1615		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/23/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/807,362	GLAUSER ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	CARALYNNE HELM	1615	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>12 July 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of Areplies: (1) an amendment, affidavioal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Aino event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (IMONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount on hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in completing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	ΓE below);	
(c) ☑ They are not deemed to place the application in bettappeal; and/or			ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1)		ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) rejected: 43-55,62 and 103-115. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 1-42 and 66-99.			
 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE B. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been conside because: See Continuation Sheet. 		•	
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Caralynne Helm/ Examiner, Art Unit 1615	/Juliet C Switzer/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1634	

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendment narrows the scope of the invention and therefore requires an additional search of the prior art in order to be fully considered.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' remarks and arguments concerning the rejections made under 35 USC 103(a) and 35 USC 112, second paragraph are directed toward the unentered amendment and for this reason are moot. Applicants' remarks regarding the rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph for "new matter" is noted, as is the lack of arguments directed toward the rejection under this same statute for enablement. Both of these rejections are maintained. Although one of ordinary skill in the art could appreciate substituted epsilon-caprolactone and substituted beta-butyrolactone as well as the de-protected version of the benzyl protected glycerine, 2-hydroxyl-1, 3-propylene diamine, beta-hydroxylmethylbutyrolactone, and hydroxyl epsilon-caprolactone depicted as components of the claimed biocompatible polymer, components derived from these compounds do not have adequate basis in the disclosure as filed. The "derived from" terminology embraces far more than participation of the claimed compounds (in protected form) as monomers in a polymerization. Applicants do not teach any synthetic pathways, other than protection of a hydroxyl group, that are envisioned for generating derivatives. Thus it is not clear that applicants had possession of the full breadth of claims 103-115 at the time of the invention.